



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,770	09/28/2000	Geoffrey Owen Blandy	AUS9-2000-0570-US1	7435
35525 75	590 04/29/2004		EXAM	INER
DUKE W. YEE			ALI, SYED J	
CARSTENS, Y	EE & CAHOON, L.L.P.			
P.O. BOX 802334			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75380			2127	6
			DATE MAILED: 04/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Pre			
	Application N	Applicant(s)			
_	09/671,770	BLANDY ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Syed J Ali	. 2127			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro	imely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Fe 2a) ⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b) □ This 3) □ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 November 2000 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ obje drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S tion is required if the drawing(s) is c	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2127

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed February 23, 2004. Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 3. Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Crelier (USPN 6,151,703).
- 4. As per claim 1, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of calling a portion of computer code in a multithreaded environment, comprising:

receiving a call to the portion of computer code (col. 4 lines 8-35);

determining if the portion of computer code is currently being compiled (col. 12 line 57 - col. 13 line 3); and

redirecting the call to an interpreter, if the portion of computer code is currently being compiled (col. 12 line 57 - col. 13 line 3).

5. As per claim 2, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, wherein the portion of computer code is a Java method (col. 3 lines 43-56).

Art Unit: 2127

6. As per claim 3, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1,

wherein redirecting the call to an interpreter includes redirecting the call to a Java Virtual

Machine Interpreter such that the portion of computer code is interpreted by the Java Virtual

Machine Interpreter in response to receiving the call to the portion of computer code (col. 12 line

57 - col. 13 line 3).

7. As per claim 4, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1,

wherein determining if the portion of computer code is currently being compiled includes

determining a setting of a flag in a control block of the portion of computer code (col. 11 lines

19-40).

8. As per claim 5, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1,

wherein the step of redirecting the call is performed in response to a Just-In-Time [JIT] invoker

field, in a control block of the portion of computer code, pointing to a JIT to Java Virtual

Machine [JVM] routine (col. 12 lines 18-30).

9. As per claim 6, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1,

further comprising:

determining if compilation of the portion of computer code has ended (col. 12 lines 31-

40); and

redirecting the call to a compiled version of the portion of computer code if the

compilation of the portion of computer code has ended (col. 12 lines 31-40).

Page 3

Art Unit: 2127

Page 4

10. As per claim 7, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 6,

wherein redirecting the call to a compiled version of the portion of computer code is performed

in response to setting a Just-In-Time [JIT] invoker field, in a control block of the portion of

computer code, to point to the compiled version of the portion of computer code (col. 12 lines

31-40).

11. As per claim 8, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1,

wherein the portion of computer code is a Java method having an associated method block and

wherein the steps of determining if the portion of computer code is currently being compiled and

redirecting the call are performed based on information stored in fields of the method block (col.

11 lines 19-40).

12. As per claims 11-18, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including an apparatus for

implementing the method of claims 1-8, respectively (Fig. 1, element 100).

13. As per claims 21-28, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer

program product in a computer readable medium for implementing the method of claims 1-8,

respectively (Fig. 1, elements 102 and 107).

Art Unit: 2127

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. Claims 9-10, 19-20, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crelier.

- As per claim 9, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 8, wherein the method block includes a field that includes a pointer that points to a Java Virtual Machine [JVM] interpreter before a Just-In-Time [JIT] compiler is loaded, points to a JIT compiler routine invokeCompiler when the JIT compiler is loaded, and points to a routine which calls a compiled version of the method once the method is compiled by the JIT compiler (col. 12 lines 18-40).
- 16. "Official Notice" is taken that the differences between the claimed JIT compiler routine "CompileThisMethod" and the routine "invokeCompiler" taught by Crelier are incidental. While there may be differences in the implementation of the routines, both are invoked by the JIT compiler that handles the compilation of a called method, and are therefore functionally equivalent.
- 17. As per claim 10, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 8, wherein the method block includes a field having a pointer that points to a Just-In-Time [JIT] compiler routine invokeCompiler when the JIT compiler is loaded and points to a compiled version of the method when compilation of the method by the JIT compiler is complete.

Page 5

Art Unit: 2127

- 18. "Official Notice" is taken that the claimed JIT compiler routine "CompileThisMethod" and the routine "invokeCompiler" are functionally equivalent for the same reasons discussed above in paragraph 16.
- 19. As per claims 19-20, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including an apparatus for implementing the method of claims 9-10, respectively (Fig. 1, element 100).
- 20. As per claims 29-30, Crelier teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program product in a computer readable medium for implementing the method of claims 9-10, respectively (Fig. 1, elements 102 and 107).

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wimble (USPN 5,812,850) teaches inline code expansion to eliminate redundant compiling.

Chambers et al. (USPN 6,427,234) teaches dynamic compilation using annotation in combination with inline code expansion.

Art Unit: 2127

Alexander, III et al. (USPN 6,507,946) teaches inline code expansion for callee methods that are non-final, i.e. undergoing compilation.

Czajkowski (USPN 6,675,375) teaches annotated compilation of Java methods.

Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on March 26, 2004 prompted the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed J Ali whose telephone number is (703) 305-8106. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5:30, 2nd Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai T An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2127

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Syed Ali

April 20, 2004

MENG-AL T. AN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100